

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed April 17, 2007 ("the Office Action"), claims 1-12 are examined. Claim 8 is objected to for informalities in the Office Action. Also, claims 1-12 are rejected as follows:

- Claims 1-6, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0069874 to Hertzog et al. ("the Hertzog publication") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,259 to Celik ("the Celik patent").
- Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Hertzog publication in view of the Celik patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,784 to McCulligh ("the McCulligh patent").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to claims 1-12, for the reasons set forth below.

The Invention

Before addressing the specific claim limitations, it will be helpful first to briefly summarize the invention of the pending claims. Embodiments of the present invention include a privacy control system in a personal and business information web card system including at least a server having at least a database and a search engine. The privacy control system includes the following: a means for storing a set of web card information of each individual user of the web card system; a means for determining privacy control levels of the web card information of the individual user as selected by the individual user; a means for transmitting, at the registration user's initiation, selected

web card information of a particular privacy control level with an authorization code to other users; a means for storing a table of authorized names of the other users for each level of privacy control; a means for looking through the table of authorized users' names when any of the other users conducts a search; and a means for generating a corresponding web card of the individual user to the other user once the authorization is confirmed.

Additional embodiments of the present invention include a method of controlling privacy in a personal web card system including at least a web card server having at least a database and a search engine. The method includes the following steps: storing a set of web card information of each individual user of the web card system in the database; determining privacy control levels of the web card information of the individual user as selected by the individual user; transmitting, at a registered user's initiation, selected web card information of a particular privacy control level with an authorization code to other users; storing a table of authorized names of the other users for each level of privacy control; looking through the table of authorized users' names when any of other users conducts a search; and generating a corresponding web card of the individual user to the other user once the authorization is confirmed.

The Objection to Claim 8 for Informalities

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 8 is objected to for informalities. In particular, the Examiner states the following: "Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: improper grammar on lines 1-2 of claim 8, 'will looks through the table'. Appropriate correction is required." In the Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment that was submitted for filing with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 19, 2007, Applicant changed the word "looks" to "look" in claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 8.

The Rejection of Claims 1-6, 9, and 12 Based on the Hertzog Publication and the Celik Patent

On pages 4 through 6 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 6, and dependent claims 2-5, 9, and 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Hertzog publication in view of the Celik patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Hertzog publication discloses a method for storing personal information that is associated with a user and that is accessible by a personal information management application. Regarding the Hertzog publication, the Examiner states the following:

Hertzog discloses a means of controlling privacy in a personal web card system (abstract) comprising:

- a) storing a set of web card information of each individual user of the web card system (paragraph 70);
- b) determining privacy control levels of the web card information of the individual user as selected by the individual user (paragraph 73);
- c) transmitting, at the registration user's initiation, selected web card information of a particular privacy control level to other users (paragraph 74);
- d) storing a table of authorized names of the other users for each level of privacy control (paragraphs 88 and 92);
- e) looking through the table of authorized users' names when any of the other users conducts a search (category tables fig 25 and paragraph 176);
- f) means for generating a corresponding web card of the individual user to the other user once the authorization is confirmed (virtual card, paragraphs 176177 [sic]).

Hertzog does not explicitly teach transmitting an authorization code with the selected web card information to other users.

The Celik patent discloses systems and methods for storing and retrieving business contact information using a computer. Regarding the Celik patent, the Examiner

states the following: “Celik discloses a means of personal information management with privacy control (abstract) including transmitting an authorization code to others with the web card information (unique identifier (col. 4, lines 9-19)).”

The Examiner’s reliance on the Hertzog publication in combination with the Celik patent is misplaced. The Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, both individually and in combination, *fail* to teach or suggest “transmitting, at the registration user’s initiation, selected web card information of a particular privacy control level with an authorization code to other users . . . and . . . generating a corresponding web card of the individual user to the other user once the authorization is confirmed,” as required by independent claims 1 and 6. In fact, *neither* the Hertzog publication *nor* the Celik patent, *nor* the combination of the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, mention transmitting an authorization code or generating a web card once authorization is configured. For this reason, Applicant submits that the § 103 rejection of independent claims 1 and 6, and dependent claims 2-5, 9, and 12, is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claim 4 Based on the Hertzog Publication and the Celik Patent

On page 5 of the Office Action, dependent claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Hertzog publication in view of the Celik patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, the Examiner states the following: “Hertzog-Celik discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 1). Hertzog further discloses wherein said means of determining privacy control levels and means for looking through the table of authorized user names forms portions of a privacy control unit (client services module, paragraph 176).”

The Examiner's reliance on the Hertzog publication is misplaced. As discussed above, the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, both individually and in combination, *fail* to teach or suggest "transmitting, at the registration user's initiation, selected web card information of a particular privacy control level with an authorization code to other users . . . and . . . generating a corresponding web card of the individual user to the other user once the authorization is confirmed," as required by independent claims 1 and 6. Furthermore, *neither* the Hertzog publication *nor* the Celik patent, *nor* the combination of the Hertzog publication and Celik patent, teach or suggest "wherein said means for determining privacy control levels and means for looking through the table of authorized users' names form portions of a privacy control unit," as required by dependent claim 4. In fact, *neither* the Hertzog publication *nor* the Celik patent, *nor* the combination of the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, mention "determining privacy control levels". For these reasons, Applicant submits that this § 103 rejection of dependent claims 4 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claim 12 Based on the Hertzog Publication and the Celik Patent

On page 6 of the Office Action, dependent claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Hertzog publication in view of the Celik patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Regarding the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, the Examiner states the following:

Hertzog-Celik discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 6). Hertzog further discloses the web card system will transmit from time to time all personal information to other selected and designated users of such information, respectively, in accordance with the authorization given to these users (synchronization, paragraphs 52-53 and 82).

The Examiner's reliance on the Hertzog publication is misplaced. As discussed above, the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, both individually and in combination, *fail* to teach or suggest "transmitting, at the registration user's initiation, selected web card information of a particular privacy control level with an authorization code to other users . . . and . . . generating a corresponding web card of the individual user to the other user once the authorization is confirmed," as required by independent claims 1 and 6. Furthermore, *neither* the Hertzog publication *nor* the Celik patent, *nor* the combination of the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, teach or suggest "wherein the web card system will transmit from time to time all personal information to other selected and designated users of such information, respectively, in accordance with the authorization given to these users," as required by dependent claim 12. In fact, *neither* the Hertzog publication *nor* the Celik patent, *nor* the combination of the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, mention the transmission of all personal information to other users in accordance with the users' authorizations. For these reasons, Applicant submits that this § 103 rejection of dependent claims 12 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 Based on the Hertzog Publication, the Celik Patent, and the McCulligh Patent

On pages 6 through 8 of the Office Action, dependent claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly obvious over the Hertzog publication in view of the Celik patent and the McCulligh patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The McCulligh patent discloses a system and method for facilitating password generation. Regarding the McCulligh patent, the Examiner states the following: "automatic generation of a security code (password) during user registration or initial user [sic] of an application is well known in the art, as suggested by McCulligh

(col 5 ln 36-50) . . . [McCulligh discloses] a means of using accessing an application through use of a username and password.”

The Examiner’s reliance on the Hertzog publication in combination with the Celik patent and the McCulligh patent is misplaced. As discussed above, the Hertzog publication and the Celik patent, both individually and in combination, *fail* to teach or suggest “transmitting, at the registration user’s initiation, selected web card information of a particular privacy control level with an authorization code to other users . . . and . . . generating a corresponding web card of the individual user to the other user once the authorization is confirmed,” as required by independent claim 6, and thus, dependent claims 7, 8, 10, and 11. Furthermore, the McCulligh patent *fails* to teach or suggest “transmitting, at the registration user’s initiation, selected web card information of a particular privacy control level with an authorization code to other users . . . and . . . generating a corresponding web card of the individual user to the other user once the authorization is confirmed,” as required by independent claim 6, and thus, dependent claims 7, 8, 10, and 11. Accordingly, *neither* the Hertzog publication, the Celik patent, *nor* the McCulligh patent, *nor* the combination of the Hertzog publication, the Celik patent, and the McCulligh patent, teach or suggest the requirements of independent claim 6, or dependent claims 7, 8, 10, and 11. For this reason, Applicant submits that the § 103 rejection of dependent claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

This application should now be in condition for a favorable action. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the Amendment and an early allowance of all claims herein. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the below

Appl. No. 09/837,497
Amdt. dated September 26, 2007
Reply to Office Action of April 17, 2007

telephone number to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,
SHELDON MAK ROSE & ANDERSON PC

Date: September 26, 2007 By: /Brian D. Martin/
Brian D. Martin
Registration No. 47,771

100 East Corson Street, Third Floor
Pasadena, California 91103-3842
Telephone: (626) 796-4000
Facsimile: (626) 795-6321